

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 10-17 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended based on, for example, page 6, lines 8-15 of the present specification and Figures 3-5, 7 and 9-11 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that with the entry of the proposed amendments, the present application will be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

In addition, the Examiner is respectfully requested to return a signed and initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 filed with Applicants' IDS on March 15, 2007, indicating that the listed documents have been considered and made of record.

**I. Response to Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Peiffer et al. (US Pat. 5,716,570).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The present invention according to claim 1 is directed to a method of forming a resin film from a first resin for a middle portion to form a resin film main body of the resin film and a second resin for edge portions to form both side edge portions in a crosswise direction of the resin film, the method comprising the steps of: joining the first resin and the second resin in such a manner as to enclose both side edges in the crosswise direction of the first resin for the middle portion which is formed as a cross-section convex shape with the second resin for the edge portions which is formed as a cross-section concave shape and to form a boundary of the

first resin and the second resin; and extruding the joined resins through an extruding die to form the resin film.

Peiffer is cited as teaching the claimed process for forming a film comprising joining a middle portion and edge portions of a film, in a molten state, such that the edge portion enclose both edges of the film main body; and extruding the joined resins through a die to form a film. In addition, the Examiner considers Peiffer as disclosing the formation of a boundary between the middle portion and edge portions of the film. The Examiner directs Applicants' attention to Fig. 3.

However, in Peiffer, the polymer B and polymer A are not joined in a manner such that both side edges of polymer B are enclosed by polymer A. Peiffer does not specifically disclose or mention the shape of the cross-section where the polymer B and polymer A are joined. In addition, based on, for example, Fig. 3 of Peiffer, the polymer A does not enclose polymer B. That is, Peiffer does not disclose a configuration enclosing both side edges of the first resin for the middle portion with the second resin, but discloses a configuration where the second resin linearly contacts both edges of the first resin.

Thus, Peiffer does not disclose joining the first resin and the second resin in such a manner as to enclose both side edges in the crosswise direction of the first resin for the middle portion with the second resin for the edge portions.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to further recite that side edges of the first resin for the middle portion is formed as a cross-section convex shape and that the second resin for the edge portions is formed as a cross-section concave shape, which is

not disclosed by Peiffer.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted Peiffer does not anticipate claim 1 since it does not disclose "joining the first resin and the second resin in such a manner as to enclose both side edges in the crosswise direction of the first resin for the middle portion which is formed as a cross-section convex shape with the second resin for the edge portions which is formed as a cross-section concave shape", as recited in claim 1.

In view of at least the above distinctions, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Peiffer.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**II. Response to Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Cloeren (US Pat. 5,120,484).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Cloeren is cited as teaching a process of forming a film comprising: joining a middle portion and edge portions of a film, in a molten state, such that the edge portion enclose both edges of the film main body; extruding the joined resins through a die to form a film; and wherein a boundary is formed between first and second layers. The Examiner directs Applicants' attention to Figs. 4-5.

However, similar to Peiffer, Cloeren does not disclose a process where a first polymer and second polymer joined in a manner such that both side edges of the first polymer are enclosed by the second polymer. Particularly, based on Figs. 4 and 6, the

output of the edge stream is parallel to the output of the core stream, and thus, the polymer forming the edge portion does not enclose the polymer forming the core portion. Accordingly, Cloeren discloses a configuration where the second resin linearly contacts both edges of the first resin, but does not disclose a configuration enclosing both side edges of the first resin for the middle portion with the second resin.

In addition, Cloeren does not disclose any particular shape of the middle or edge portions.

Therefore, Cloeren does anticipate claim 1 since Cloeren does not disclose "joining the first resin and the second resin in such a manner as to enclose both side edges in the crosswise direction of the first resin for the middle portion which is formed as a cross-section convex shape with the second resin for the edge portions which is formed as a cross-section concave shape", as recited in claim 1.

In view of at least the above distinction, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Cloeren.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**III. Response to Rejection of Claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 2-5 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pelffer et al. In view of Kegasawa et al. (US Pat. 6,203,742).

In addition, claims 2-5 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cloeren in view of Kegasawa et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2-5 and 10-17 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and thus, it is

respectfully submitted these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In addition, Kegasawa does not make up for the deficiencies of the primary references.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 and 10-17 is respectfully requested.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelko K. Takagi  
Registration No. 47,121

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 21, 2007